Wendie A Berg

List of Publications by Year in descending order

Source: https://exaly.com/author-pdf/6603053/publications.pdf

Version: 2024-02-01

73 8,345 38 68
papers citations h-index g-index

74 74 5318
all docs docs citations times ranked citing authors

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
1	Diagnostic Accuracy of Mammography, Clinical Examination, US, and MR Imaging in Preoperative Assessment of Breast Cancer. Radiology, 2004, 233, 830-849.	7.3	1,268
2	Combined Screening With Ultrasound and Mammography vs Mammography Alone in Women at Elevated Risk of Breast Cancer. JAMA - Journal of the American Medical Association, 2008, 299, 2151.	7.4	1,222
3	Detection of Breast Cancer With Addition of Annual Screening Ultrasound or a Single Screening MRI to Mammography in Women With Elevated Breast Cancer Risk. JAMA - Journal of the American Medical Association, 2012, 307, 1394.	7.4	897
4	Shear-wave Elastography Improves the Specificity of Breast US: The BE1 Multinational Study of 939 Masses. Radiology, 2012, 262, 435-449.	7.3	714
5	Breast Imaging Reporting and Data System. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2000, 174, 1769-1777.	2.2	496
6	High-Resolution Fluorodeoxyglucose Positron Emission Tomography with Compression ("Positron) Tj ETQq0 0 0 12, 309-323.	rgBT /Ove	erlock 10 Tf 50 218
7	Ultrasound as the Primary Screening Test for Breast Cancer: Analysis From ACRIN 6666. Journal of the National Cancer Institute, 2016, 108, djv367.	6.3	201
8	A deep learning method for classifying mammographic breast density categories. Medical Physics, 2018, 45, 314-321.	3.0	188
9	Cystic Lesions of the Breast: Sonographic-Pathologic Correlation. Radiology, 2003, 227, 183-191.	7.3	185
10	Breast Cancer: Comparative Effectiveness of Positron Emission Mammography and MR Imaging in Presurgical Planning for the Ipsilateral Breast. Radiology, 2011, 258, 59-72.	7.3	172
11	Operator Dependence of Physician-performed Whole-Breast US: Lesion Detection and Characterization. Radiology, 2006, 241, 355-365.	7.3	171
12	Reasons Women at Elevated Risk of Breast Cancer Refuse Breast MR Imaging Screening: ACRIN 6666. Radiology, 2010, 254, 79-87.	7.3	163
13	Tailored Supplemental Screening for Breast Cancer: What Now and What Next?. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2009, 192, 390-399.	2.2	158
14	Does Training in the Breast Imaging Reporting and Data System (BI-RADS) Improve Biopsy Recommendations or Feature Analysis Agreement with Experienced Breast Imagers at Mammography?. Radiology, 2002, 224, 871-880.	7.3	155
15	Cystic Breast Masses and the ACRIN 6666 Experience. Radiologic Clinics of North America, 2010, 48, 931-987.	1.8	138
16	Toward a standardized breast ultrasound lexicon, BI-RADS: Ultrasound. Seminars in Roentgenology, 2001, 36, 217-225.	0.6	131
17	Biopsy of Amorphous Breast Calcifications: Pathologic Outcome and Yield at Stereotactic Biopsy. Radiology, 2001, 221, 495-503.	7.3	128
18	Breast density implications and supplemental screening. European Radiology, 2019, 29, 1762-1777.	4.5	115

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
19	Preliminary results for positron emission mammography: real-time functional breast imaging in a conventional mammography gantry. European Journal of Nuclear Medicine and Molecular Imaging, 1996, 23, 804-806.	2.1	87
20	Probably Benign Lesions at Screening Breast US in a Population with Elevated Risk: Prevalence and Rate of Malignancy in the ACRIN 6666 Trial. Radiology, 2013, 269, 701-712.	7. 3	86
21	Deep Learning to Distinguish Recalled but Benign Mammography Images in Breast Cancer Screening. Clinical Cancer Research, 2018, 24, 5902-5909.	7.0	86
22	Core Needle Breast Biopsy in Patients Undergoing Anticoagulation Therapy. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2000, 174, 245-249.	2.2	83
23	Deep learning modeling using normal mammograms for predicting breast cancer risk. Medical Physics, 2020, 47, 110-118.	3.0	71
24	MR Imaging of Extracapsular Silicone from Breast Implants. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2002, 178, 465-472.	2.2	64
25	Diagnostic Performance of MRI, Molecular Breast Imaging, and Contrast-enhanced Mammography in Women with Newly Diagnosed Breast Cancer. Radiology, 2019, 293, 531-540.	7.3	64
26	Comparative Effectiveness of Positron Emission Mammography and MRI in the Contralateral Breast of Women With Newly Diagnosed Breast Cancer. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2012, 198, 219-232.	2.2	62
27	Lexicon for standardized interpretation of gamma camera molecular breast imaging: observer agreement and diagnostic accuracy. European Journal of Nuclear Medicine and Molecular Imaging, 2012, 39, 971-982.	6.4	60
28	Quantitative Maximum Shear-Wave Stiffness of Breast Masses as a Predictor of Histopathologic Severity. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2015, 205, 448-455.	2.2	59
29	Current Status of Supplemental Screening in Dense Breasts. Journal of Clinical Oncology, 2016, 34, 1840-1843.	1.6	59
30	Multiple Bilateral Circumscribed Masses at Screening Breast US: Consider Annual Follow-up. Radiology, 2013, 268, 673-683.	7. 3	56
31	Training the ACRIN 6666 Investigators and Effects of Feedback on Breast Ultrasound Interpretive Performance and Agreement in BI-RADS Ultrasound Feature Analysis. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2012, 199, 224-235.	2.2	53
32	Lesion Detection and Characterization in a Breast US Phantom: Results of the ACRIN 6666 Investigators. Radiology, 2006, 239, 693-702.	7. 3	51
33	Interpretation of Positron Emission Mammography and MRI by Experienced Breast Imaging Radiologists: Performance and Observer Reproducibility. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2011, 196, 971-981.	2.2	51
34	Screening Breast Ultrasound Using Handheld or Automated Technique in Women with Dense Breasts. Journal of Breast Imaging, 2019, 1, 283-296.	1.3	51
35	Sonographically Depicted Breast Clustered Microcysts: Is Follow-Up Appropriate?. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2005, 185, 952-959.	2.2	49
36	Benefits of Screening Mammography. JAMA - Journal of the American Medical Association, 2010, 303, 168.	7.4	45

#	Article	IF	Citations
37	Gamma Camera Breast Imaging Lexicon. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2012, 199, W767-W774.	2.2	44
38	Technologist-performed Handheld Screening Breast US Imaging: How Is It Performed and What Are the Outcomes to Date?. Radiology, 2014, 272, 12-27.	7.3	43
39	Cancer Yield and Patterns of Follow-up for BI-RADS Category 3 after Screening Mammography Recall in the National Mammography Database. Radiology, 2020, 296, 32-41.	7. 3	38
40	Screening Algorithms in Dense Breasts: <i>AJR</i> Expert Panel Narrative Review. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2021, 216, 275-294.	2,2	38
41	Dedicated Breast Gamma Camera Imaging and Breast PET. PET Clinics, 2018, 13, 363-381.	3.0	35
42	Beyond Standard Mammographic Screening: Mammography at Age Extremes, Ultrasound, and MR Imaging. Radiologic Clinics of North America, 2007, 45, 895-906.	1.8	29
43	Nuclear Breast Imaging: Clinical Results and Future Directions. Journal of Nuclear Medicine, 2016, 57, 46S-52S.	5.0	28
44	Breast MRI contrast enhancement kinetics of normal parenchyma correlate with presence of breast cancer. Breast Cancer Research, 2016, 18, 76.	5.0	25
45	DCE-MRI Background Parenchymal Enhancement Quantified from an Early versus Delayed Post-contrast Sequence: Association with Breast Cancer Presence. Scientific Reports, 2017, 7, 2115.	3.3	20
46	Grouped Amorphous Calcifications at Mammography: Frequently Atypical but Rarely Associated with Aggressive Malignancy. Radiology, 2018, 288, 671-679.	7.3	20
47	Breast Density and Risk of Interval Cancers: The Effect of Annual Versus Biennial Screening Mammography Policies in Canada. Canadian Association of Radiologists Journal, 2022, 73, 90-100.	2.0	18
48	Palpable Breast Lump Triage by Minimally Trained Operators in Mexico Using Computer-Assisted Diagnosis and Low-Cost Ultrasound. Journal of Global Oncology, 2018, 4, 1-9.	0.5	17
49	Impact of Original and Artificially Improved Artificial Intelligence–based Computer-aided Diagnosis on Breast US Interpretation. Journal of Breast Imaging, 2021, 3, 301-311.	1.3	17
50	Reducing Unnecessary Biopsy and Follow-up of Benign Cystic Breast Lesions. Radiology, 2020, 295, 52-53.	7.3	16
51	How Well Does Supplemental Screening Magnetic Resonance Imaging Work in High-Risk Women?. Journal of Clinical Oncology, 2014, 32, 2193-2196.	1.6	15
52	Use of Breast-Specific PET Scanners and Comparison with MR Imaging. Magnetic Resonance Imaging Clinics of North America, 2018, 26, 265-272.	1.1	12
53	BI-RADS 3 on Screening Breast Ultrasound: What Is It and What Is the Appropriate Management?. Journal of Breast Imaging, 2021, 3, 527-538.	1.3	12
54	Cancer Yield Exceeds 2% for BI-RADS 3 Probably Benign Findings in Women Older Than 60 Years in the National Mammography Database. Radiology, 2021, 299, 550-558.	7.3	11

#	Article	IF	Citations
55	Training Radiologists to Interpret Contrast-enhanced Mammography: Toward a Standardized Lexicon. Journal of Breast Imaging, 2021, 3, 176-189.	1.3	7
56	How Should Screening Breast US Be Audited? The Patient Perspective. Radiology, 2014, 272, 309-315.	7.3	5
57	Can Optoacoustic Imaging Safely Reduce Benign Breast Biopsies?. Radiology, 2018, 287, 413-415.	7.3	5
58	Linkage of the ACR National Mammography Database to the Network of State Cancer Registries: Proof of Concept Evaluation by the ACR National Mammography Database Committee. Journal of the American College of Radiology, 2019, 16, 8-14.	1.8	5
59	A Prospective Study of Automated Breast Ultrasound Screening of Women with Dense Breasts in a Digital Breast Tomosynthesis-based Practice. Journal of Breast Imaging, 2020, 2, 125-133.	1.3	4
60	Effect of an educational intervention on women's healthcare provider knowledge gaps about breast density, breast cancer risk, and screening. Menopause, 2021, 28, 909-917.	2.0	4
61	Encapsulated Papillary Carcinoma of the Breast: Imaging Features with Histopathologic Correlation. Journal of Breast Imaging, 2020, 2, 590-597.	1.3	4
62	Nipple Adenoma: Correlation of Imaging Findings and Histopathology. Journal of Breast Imaging, 2022, 4, 408-412.	1.3	4
63	Benefits of Supplemental Ultrasonography With Mammography. JAMA Internal Medicine, 2019, 179, 1150.	5.1	2
64	Radiologic Technologist and Radiologist Knowledge Gaps about Breast Density Revealed by an Online Continuing Education Course. Journal of Breast Imaging, 2020, 2, 315-329.	1.3	2
65	Breast MRI for "the Masses― European Radiology, 2022, 32, 4034-4035.	4.5	2
66	Optimizing the Breast Imaging Report for Today and Tomorrow. Journal of Breast Imaging, 0, , .	1.3	2
67	Granular Cell Tumor of the Breast: Radiologic–Pathologic Correlation. Journal of Breast Imaging, 2021, 3, 473-481.	1.3	1
68	Is It Really Time to Close the Chapter on Screening Breast US?. Radiology, 2021, 301, E414-E414.	7.3	1
69	Comment on Thigpen D. et al. The Role of Ultrasound in Screening Dense Breasts—A Review of the Literature and Practical Solutions for Implementation. Diagnostics 2018, 8, 20. Diagnostics, 2018, 8, 37.	2.6	0
70	Comment on Aminololama-Shakeri et al, "Screening Guidelines and Supplemental Screening Tools: Assessment of the Adequacy of Patient–Provider Discussion.―Journal of Breast Imaging 2019;1(2). Journal of Breast Imaging, 2019, 1, 276-276.	1.3	0
71	Corrections: Breast cancer screening guidelines for young women of color. Cancer, 2022, 128, 849-850.	4.1	0
72	Enhancing Cherry Hemangioma: A Mimic for Breast Cancer on Contrast-Enhanced Mammography. American Journal of Roentgenology, 2022, , .	2.2	0

#	Article	IF	CITATIONS
73	Utilization and Cancer Yield of Probably Benign Assessment Category in the National Mammography Database: 2009 to 2018. Journal of the American College of Radiology, 2022, , .	1.8	O